of the existence of each. Or, to take another illustration. By means of the senses, we arrive at a knowledge of the existence of sounds, colours, and other external objects: and we are certain, from our consciousness, that we are possessed of intellectual ideas; no reasonable mind demands more than the separate evidence of each; no man requires some mysterious link binding them together to be pointed out, in order to believe in both. Now, we are not required to act on a different principle, in order to a rational belief, both in the moral responsibility and physical dependence of man. But does some one declare them to be contradictory ? We ask him for his proof. He can throw the *onusprobandi* upon us, in reference to the two truths advanced by us, and we are ready to furnish him with abundant proofs. But if he bring in a third proposition, to the effect that our two propositions are contradictory, we now throw the *onus probandi* upon him ; and his proof will turn out to be nothing but his proposition re-asserted, or a logomachy in which general phrases are used to which no distinct meaning can be attached, or used in one sense to establish conclusions which can be legitimately drawn from them only when used in a totally different sense.

Such general considerations as these should satisfy the mind, that both truths may be established, though no man could point out the bond connecting them; or though there should be no link beyond the general relation of all things to one another in the Divine mind and purpose. Far as the eye can reach, these two truths are seen running parallel to each other. Possibly there may be no point in which they coincide, but there is certainly no point in which they come in collision till they terminate in the supreme Source of all power and all good.*

But let us plunge a little into the thicket, so far at least as to discover that nothing is to be gained by penetrating farther. If

* The power of will, and the universal reign of causation, we hold to be ultimate facts attested by primary principles in our constitution. Necessarians have commonly denied the one, and Libertarians the other, as reaching at least to the will. We maintain both, because we have evidence for each. As being ultimate facts, we apprehend there can be no connexion discovered between them by us. If there could be a connexion discovered, this would show that they were not ultimate facts, but that they met in a farther unity. While it is vain, as we suspect, to seek for a connexion, it is assuredly vain to seek for a contradiction; and it is wrong to represent the one doctrine as setting aside the other.